

REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 29, 2008, in which claims 21-33, 37 and 38 were allowed over the prior art of record. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the comments set forth below.

By this Amendment, independent claims 34-36, 39-42 are amended to recite the allowable feature of the pointing device operation, and new claims 43-44 are presented containing that feature. In addition, the dependencies of allowed claims 23, 29 and 31-33 are revised and minor editorial changes are made to allowed claims dependent claims 22 and 29. Accordingly, claims 21-44 are pending in the present application, 14 of the claims being independent and a total of 24 claims being presented.

Claims 39 and 42 were objected to because of the informality noted on page 2 of the Action. The foregoing amendments to the claims clarify that a feature recited in claim 42 is not recited in claim 39. Accordingly, the scope of independent claims 39 and 42 are different. Withdrawal of this objection is requested.

Claims 34-36 were rejected as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,683,628 to Nakagawa in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,920,614 to Schindler and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,538,993 to Krumholz. Claims 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakagawa, Shindler and Montlick (?) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,699,043 to Ho et al. These rejections are traversed in view of the amendments to the claims.

At the top of page 7 of the Action, the Examiner states that “the prior art does not teach ‘the pointing device is operable to: take precedence over the remote signaling devices;

and selectively enable each remote signaling device””. In view of the indication of this feature as not being disclosed or taught by the prior art (i.e., allowable), independent claims 34, 35, 36, 39, 40, 41, and 42 have amended to include this feature. Consequently, claims 34-36 and 39-42 and newly presented claims 43-44 should be allowed over the prior art of record, as well as claims 21-33 and 37-38 of the present application.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the objections and rejection of record be withdrawn and that a Notice of Allowance be issued indicating that claims 21-44 are allowed over the prior art of record.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge our Deposit Account No. 22-0261 in the amount of \$440.00 for two additional independent claims. Any necessary additional fees are hereby authorized to be charged, and any overpayments credited to, our Deposit Account No. 22-0261, referencing our Docket No. 45792-206763.

Should the Examiner believe that a conference would advance the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 28, 2009

/Catherine M. Voorhees/
Catherine M. Voorhees
Registration No. 33,074
VENABLE LLP
P.O. Box 34385
Washington, D.C. 20043-9998
Telephone: (202) 344-4000
Telefax: (202) 344-8300

CMV/elw

::ODMA\PCDOCS\DC2DOCS\1\011131\1